

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Decision on Appeal dated August 21, 2007. In the Office Action dated November 2, 2005, Claims 1-11, 13-15, 17 and 18 were rejected, and Claims 12 and 16 were objected to. In order to expedite prosecution of this Application, Applicant amends Claims 1, 3, 12, 13, 16 and 18, Applicant cancels without prejudice or disclaimer Claim 11, and Applicant adds new Claims 19-29. Thus, Claims 1-10 and 12-29 remain pending in the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-9, 11, 13-15, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,150,896 issued to Wakeman (hereinafter "*Wakeman*"). Claim 11 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering the rejection of Claim 11 moot. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for remaining Claims 1-9, 13-15, 17 and 18.

Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites "said telescopic hinge comprising a latching member configured to engage said housing to prevent inadvertent decoupling of said at least one telescopic hinge from said housing." Applicant respectfully submits that *Wakeman* does not disclose or even suggest at least this limitation of Claim 1. For example, *Wakeman* appears to disclose a support member 25 for coupling a cover 27 to a copier housing 21 where the support member 25 comprises a hinge 35, a support arm 30, a rectangular arm 33 (coupled to the cover 27), and a positioning rod 31 (*Wakeman*, column 3, lines 45-51, figures 1, 5 and 6). *Wakeman* also appears to disclose that the positioning rod 31 is slidably inserted into a hole 32/sleeve bearing in the copier housing 21 to enable variable positioning of the cover 27 relative to the copier housing 21 of *Wakeman* (*Wakeman*, column 3, lines 52-5-, figures 5 and 6). However, *Wakeman* does not appear to disclose or even suggest "a latching member configured to engage said housing to prevent inadvertent decoupling of said at least one telescopic hinge from said housing" as recited by Claim 1. To the contrary, the support member 25, hinge 35, support arm 30, rectangular arm 33 (coupled to the cover 27), and positioning rod 31 of *Wakeman* appear to readily removable from the copier housing 21 of *Wakeman* without any device or element in

Wakeman that would appear to prevent any inadvertent removal therefrom. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over *Wakeman*.

Claims 2-9 that depend from independent Claim 1 are also not anticipated by *Wakeman* at least because they incorporate the limitations of Claim 1 and also add additional elements that further distinguish *Wakeman*. Further, Claims 13-15, 17 and 18 depend from Claim 12, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable if rewritten in independent form, and which Applicant has so rewritten in independent form. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1-9, 13-15, 17 and 18 be withdrawn.

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over *Wakeman* in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,832,937 issued to Moore et al. (hereinafter "*Moore*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 10 depends from independent Claim 1. As indicated above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Further, *Moore* does not appear to remedy at least the deficiencies of *Wakeman* indicated above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objected to Claims 12 and 16 as being dependent on a rejected base claim. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that Claims 12 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 12 has been rewritten in independent form, and Claim 16 has been amended to depend from Claim 12.. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 12 and 16.

NEW CLAIMS

Applicant adds new Claims 19-29. New independent Claim 19 recites "said at least one telescopic hinge comprising a plurality of segments slidably coupled to each other, said at least one telescopic hinge configured to prevent inadvertent decoupling of said plurality of segments relative to each other" (emphasis added). New independent Claim 24 recites "a first segment coupled to said housing and a second segment slidably coupled to said first segment, at least one of said first and second segments configured to prevent inadvertent decoupling of said first and second segments relative to each" (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 19 and 24 are patentable over the cited art of record.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of new independent Claims 19 and 24 and Claims 20-23 and 25-29 which depend respectively from new independent Claims 19 and 24.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

An RCE filing fee of \$810.00 is believed due. Further, an excess claims fee of \$610.00 is believed due. The Director of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company the amount of \$1420.00 to satisfy the RCE filing and excess claim fees. If, however, Applicant has miscalculated the fee due with this RCE, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this RCE to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,



James L. Baudino
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: October 12, 2007

Correspondence to:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-